

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO

(Action commenced in County of York)

HARRY PARKMA  
and OLEV TRASS

v.

MART TARUM

FRESH AS  
AMENDED STATEMENT OF CLAIM

BEST AVAILABLE

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
SOURCES METHODS EXEMPTION 3B2B  
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT  
DATE 2003 2006

10th Mar 60  
Bogart, Estallor  
Defendant

Keith, Ganong, Mahoney & Keith  
25 Adelaide Street West, Toronto

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO

B E T W E E N:

HARRY PARKMA  
and OLEV TRASS

Plaintiffs

- and -

EERIK HEINE  
and MART TARUM

I, KARL EERME, presently residing at Apartment 27,  
8 Corinth Gardens, Toronto, make oath and say as follows:

1. On Saturday, October 29th, 1966, at approximately 4.00 p.m. the above named defendant Eerik Heine unexpectedly paid a call upon me at my apartment at 8 Corinth Gardens, Toronto. In response to his knock on my door I opened the door and he asked for permission to step in and have a talk with me.
2. We took seats in my living room and Heine immediately asked if I would agree to help him in stopping the "accusation-campaign" in the Estonian community. I asked him to explain what was meant by that. Thereupon Heine showed me a sheet of paper, and as far as I recall from its cursory examination purported to be an official statement signed by Heine, addressed to a court, and verified by lawyer A. Park, in which Heine declared that publication of ETA bulletins in connection with the Sirge-affair by him, Heine, was known to the R.C.M.P.

# BEST AVAILABLE COPY

2.

3. Eerik Heine then proposed that we, that is, Heine and myself, sign a joint communique addressed to the Estonian community declaring that all matters regarding the Sirge visit of September, 1964, in Toronto have now been settled and finished.

4. I expressed astonishment and told Heine that such a communique cannot settle and finish anything, and in particular, it cannot stop the lawsuit in which he is now a defendant. I told him that the lawsuit has recently exposed him, and this was the right direction since it was only aimed at exposing everyone and everything involved in publishing the ETA bulletins, thus serving the cause of the Estonian community to expose the truth.

5. I further told him that a communique, ineffective by itself, would be another attempt to suppress the facts behind the ETA bulletins. I also pointed out that Parkma and Trass, whose main objective has been to expose all facts about ETA, cannot be forced by means of issuing a public communique to stop halfway from that objective.

6. Heine seemed to share my view in this respect, however he said to me: "You never know, maybe - after all ...", and continued to insist that I sign the communique. He also said that if further court action cannot be stopped then there will be new revelations unpleasant to many (involved in the Sirge-affair) and that the R.C.M.P. who knew about the publication of ETA bulletins will then also get involved.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

3.

7. We then discussed in some detail the Sirge visit at my home on September 21st, 1964, and Heine said that he now has to admit that there was no secret meeting as suggested in ETA bulletins, that it was just another gathering of old friends, literary people.

8. Upon my question to him: "Why did you then brand me as a Communist sympathizer and greet me at the meeting of the Executive of the Estonian Central Council on September 28th, 1964, with 'Et tu, Brutus!' and demand that I be expelled from the Estonian Central Council." Heine answered that then things appeared to him in a different light than they are today.

QPC  
9. I reminded Heine of the fact that we two have been friends from the time of his arrival in Toronto, that I was the first press reporter to interview him, and that as a true friend it would have been easy for him to obtain all facts about the Sirge visit directly from me instead of anonymously launching a smear campaign in the ETA bulletins. I further reminded him that none of those who attended the gathering on September 21st, 1964, had made a secret of it, and I personally informed several friends prior to the meeting as well as thereafter of everything, and that I had further provided the facts to the editors of our newspapers.

10. Again Heine seemed to agree with me, but nevertheless he came out with the outworn accusation previously made in the ETA bulletins that Parkma had not revealed all the facts he knew. I

# BEST AVAILABLE COPY

4.

had to contradict him in this respect and told Heine that Parkma had nothing to conceal because all he knew from our brief encounter on the morning of September 21st, 1964, was that Sirge was in town and that I was going to meet him.

11. Heine then returned to the theme of the joint communique, wondering why I should refuse to help him to stop further court proceedings with its undesirable publicity and suggested that I may take time to make up my mind. I repeated my reasons for disagreeing with him, and told Heine that he was to blame for splitting the Estonian community, and that Parkma and Trass had no other way to expose the truth which was sought by all Estonians but to resort to court action.

12. I further told Heine that I did not believe his story of being the sole publisher of the ETA bulletins, and that distribution of 3,000 copies as announced in ETA bulletin No. 1 is proof in itself that a number of accomplices must have been involved. Thereupon Heine told me that only 800 copies were mailed, that he did everything alone and that he used an old mailing list available since the time of the Estonian Central Council elections in 1963, when a pamphlet was mailed.

13. I still disagreed with him and told Heine about an ETA incident which took place in 1964 prior to publication of/bulletin No. 3, that Heine called me on the telephone and requested that I tell him the names of all persons who knew of the gathering on

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

5.

September 21st, 1964, in advance of the evening meeting with Sirge. When I asked Heine for what purpose this information was required by him, he told me at that time that he is making the enquiry on behalf of a certain group whose names he could not reveal. My reply to him at that time was that I refused to supply information to anonymous persons or their spokesman. I further told him that my conclusion was then, in 1964, as it is now, that Heine was not the sole publisher and distributor of the ETA bulletins.

14. Heine took his leave, thanking me for the opportunity of discussing matters of common interest, and expressing the hope that I would still accept his proposal regarding the communique and asking me not to reveal anything about his visit to me, to Parkma.

15. Immediately after Heine's departure I thought it advisable to have our discussion recorded in writing and this is a translation in English of my memorandum written at that time in the Estonian language.

SWORN before me at the City )  
of Toronto, in the County of )  
York, this 7<sup>th</sup> day of )  
November, 1966.

*Robert P. Prentiss*  
A Commissioner, etc.

*Carl Eesma*